

Remarks

In the office action mailed October 27, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8, 16-17, 28, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,473,894 (Lopez), the Examiner rejected claims 7, 18, 29-30, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Lopez, and the Examiner rejected claims 19-20 and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Lopez in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,578 (Hohmann). In addition, the Examiner objected to claims 9-10, 13-15, 21-23, and 31-34 but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 9 (including intervening claim 8) that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, and Applicant has accordingly cancelled claims 8 and 9. (Applicant has also amended claims 10 and 13 to depend from claim 1 instead of claims 8 and 9.) Applicant submits that claim 1 is now allowable per the Examiner's indication. Further, Applicant submits that claims 2-7, 10, and 13-18 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claim 1.

Applicant has amended claim 19 to include the subject matter of claim 21 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, and Applicant has accordingly cancelled claim 21. (Applicant has also amended claim 22 to depend from claim 19 instead of claim 21.) Applicant submits that claim 19 is now allowable per the Examiner's indication. Further, Applicant submits that claims 20 and 22-27 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claim 19.

Applicant has amended claim 28 to include the subject matter of claim 31 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable (although Applicant changed the words "a first" to be "the" for consistency), and Applicant has accordingly cancelled claim 31. (Applicant has also amended claim 32 to depend from claim 28 instead of claim 31, and Applicant has made a minor change to claim 33 for clarification.) Applicant submits that claim 28 is allowable as indicated by the Examiner. Further, Applicant submits that claims 29-30 and 32-35 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claim 28.

Applicant has amended claim 36 to include the features of repeating steps "to provide a plurality of wall ties with each wall tie having a connector placed over its second end" and "threading a reinforcement wire through said hole of each connector in turn so as to link the plurality of connectors and fasteners to a single length of reinforcement wire". As the Examiner indicated on page 9 of the office action that the prior art does not disclose a single reinforcement wire being threaded through multiple connectors and there is no teaching or motivation within the specification of the closest prior art to suggest such a modification, Applicant submits that claim 36 should be allowable as well.

By making the above amendments, Application does not acquiesce in the claim rejections, and Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue the rejected claims in a continuation application. Applicant has made these amendments to expedite prosecution and allowance.

In summary, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are now allowable. Applicant therefore respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2141.

Respectfully submitted,
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: January 27, 2009

By: /Lawrence H. Aaronson/
Lawrence H. Aaronson
Reg. No. 35,818